## CUT MOTION No. 10

### Relief to prawn fishing industry

**Mr. Ephraim Ouseph** *(Narakkal)* : Sir, the motion standing in my name is.—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16,603 for Fisheries by Re. 1. (The Government have failed to give adequate relief to the prawn fishing industry hard hit by the loss of the Burma Market).*

I come from the greatest centre of fishing industry in the State. In the Administration Report of 1117, the Government have said.—"The fishing industry suffered a serious setback owing to the closure of Burma market for prawns, the staple product of the Cochin backwaters. To redress the grievances of fishermen on this account, liberal remissions in rent on fisheries were granted by Government. The department made attempts to find out new markets for prawn produce and experimented on the possibilities of preserving prawns in edible condition. It also continued the policy of extending concessional leases of inland fisheries to associations of fishermen and agriculturists wherever possible." The Revenue Department Report also says.—"In view of the loss sustained by fishermen on this account, Government were graciously pleased to grant a remission of 50 per cent of the tax due from the licensees for wet land and inland fishery, 12½ per cent of the tax on fishing stakes and Chinese nets and on Vativala and Changala-pachal among minor fishery contrivances."

I thinkthese reports were written with an eye to propaganda.

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*: Nothing. We have actually allowed 50 per cent remission last year, and this year also.

**Mr. Ephraim Ouseph** *(Narakkal)* : That is what I am going to deal with. Apart from these two remissions, no further relief has been given. My point is it is totally inadequate. They have said, they have made an earnest attempt to find alternative markets. According to their own case, there is a total failure of the markets and this particular tax has been a very recent one, the natural course would have been a total remission of the tax. Already the same land is taxed for agricultural purposes and it is in the nature of a second crop. These private traders cannot be expected to venture into researches for new markets. It is essentially a duty of the Government, because the result of a research, cannot be enjoyed by a particular trader. The Government has that responsibility. We know prawn is a kind of fish which can be preserved in any form for about 3 months in tact. They should have made a better effort to find a suitable market. Not only have they not found a suitable market, or given total remission, they have added insult to injury by creating restrictions on export. Prawns, as it is well known, is not consumed here. The other fishes in the dried form are exported, and it is possible that there may be a market in the present conditions and even on that score, the traders interested and the others interested in this, have made repeated representations to lift the ban on export even of that variety, but I do not take a particular position on that matter now because it has got to be enquired into whether the other kinds of fish could find a suitable market in Cochin State itself. But prawns, as it is admitted by the Government, has no market inside the State and they should not have introduced this ban. They will say that they have really given permits. Considering the difficulties and the delay experienced in the matter of obtaining permits, it would have been much better to repeal the restriction altogether and also to repeal the tax on it. The great difficulty is because of this tax and ban the industry has been completely stopped in many cases. People have completely stopped fishing for prawns. The other day, the Minister was complaining to me about the great difficulty to get the dust of the prawns, which is an excellent form of manure. Another difficulty is, this supplementary income used to go a long way in meeting the cost of bunding these lands in littoral areas. For these reasons, this tax is not only regressive but also has acted as a paralysis on production. On these grounds, I think the Government have failed to give adequate protection to this industry.

**Mr. V. J. Mathai** *(Planters)* : What is the remedy you suggest?

**Mr. Ephraim Ouseph** *(Narakkal)* : The immediate measure I want is the total remission of the tax on the second crop and the lifting of the ban and appointing a responsible body to find out a suitable market outside the State for the stuff that is preserved. Preserving has already been done. The great virtue of prawn is that it can be preserved without tins. It can be preserved for about 3 months in sacks. It cannot be preserved for more than that period in sacks.

**Mr. Joseph Pettah** *(Adur)* : Considering that, in regard to the agriculturists a large portion of the second crop assessment has been remitted by the Government, and considering that this is another item of food production and that we are asking everybody—may urging everybody—to catch more fish, and also that export of fish is not allowed—considering all these will the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Government consider the question of remitting the tax in this case? We would like to know the view of the Government.

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*: So far as the crop is concerned, it is on a particular basis of net produce. Here it is a license fee—3 rupees for the first class paddy field per acre, 2 rupees for second class and one rupee for the third class. These people are making, 50, 70 and even 100 rupees per acre. This is only a license fee. Now we have reduced the rates to Rs. 1—8—0, Re. 1 and annas 8. They may make profits 25 and 30 times of that. For fields in which there has been no fishing at all, they are not asked to take out a license.

**Mr. V. J. Mathai** *(Planters)*: I hope this is not to be taken as a Government reply.

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*: I was only explaining. I was asked to explain.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ: ആ സ്ഥലത്തു രണ്ടാമതൊരു വിളവിറക്കുന്നുണ്ടോ?

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*: It is not analogous a second crop.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: May I know whether there was not a ban on the export of all kinds of fish.

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*: Yes, but it was not absolute, it is only conditional. Permits are given for export.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: But I would like to know further.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ: ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ ബ്യിട്ടീഷിൽനിന്നു ഇങ്ങോട്ടു കടത്തുവാൻ പാടില്ല.

**Mr. M. M. Paul** *(Director of Food Supplies)*: I shall explain. In the case of prawns, the major portion of the prawns has been allowed to be exported even after the ban. There is no complete ban. Permits are given to export a major quantity of the prawns.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: Now what about other kinds of fish? The ban applies to all kinds of fish. What is behind the ban? You want all sorts of food-stuffs to be raised and to catch all kinds of fish that are available here.

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*: Yes, we wanted to reserve for us what we required. We had complaints that all the fish available were being exported and that fish was not available in the market for the consumers here. They had to pay 10 or 20 times the cost. It had cost originally only 1/10 of it. It was, therefore, it was because of the dearth of fish in the market for local consumption, that this ban was introduced. At the same time it was conditional. Whenever we found that a paticular sort of fish was not much in demand, we gave permits for its export.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: I want to know when the ban was introduced.

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*: Some four months back.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: I want to know the exact date.

**Mr. M. M. Paul** *(Director of Food Supplies)*: On the 14th Meenam 1118.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: Are the Government aware that there are all sorts of complaints from the persons who are engaged in this industry that there is a large variety of fish that is not wanted here, and for which there is a market in the immediate neighbouring Travancore State and the British territory, and because of the ban, they are not able to sell them and so this sort of fish are left to rot. Are the Government prepared to take it from their hands?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran** *(Secretary to Government)*: Yes, there were complaints.

**Mr. M. M. Paul** *(Director of Food Supplies)*: Yes, I shall explain. There was a complaint that surplus quantity of fish; if not exported to other parts will be wasted. Now that is mostly dried fish and prawns. As regards prawns, even now, large quantities are being allowed to be exported. As regards dry fish, till very recently, more than 60 per cent was allowed to be exported but now in some of the northern places of the State like Trichur and other taluks, there is a market for this fish and it is imported into those places. The export of fish to those places from neighbouring British parts have also been prohibited, and there were complaints that people in those parts were not getting dry fish. So we are diverting this fish to these parts. There has been greater restriction on the export of raw fish and no quantity of raw fish is allowed to rot.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: Is there not any surlpus quantity of raw fish?

**Mr. M. M. Paul** *(Director of Food Supplies)*: The complaints were as regards dried fish.

**Mr. V. J. Mathai** *(Planters)*: Is salted fish going to Nilgiris?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

**Mr. M. M. Paul** *(Director of Food Supplies)*: No.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: Are the Government aware of the serious difficulties of transport with regard to the quantities of fish for which you will be pleased to give license. Is there not serious difficulty? For example, suppose there is a great demand from Kunnamkulam. We have a large stock of fish and even if you grant a license, there would be the difficulty of transport, which is very well known to the Government.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran** *(Secretary to Government)*: Food-stuffs always get priority in railways.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: Fish won't wait for priority.

**Mr. M. M. Paul** *(Director of Food Supplies)*: As regards transport of fish by rail, there is no difficulty. We have an assurance from the Railway authorities that they would arrange transport even by the Mail train. We are also trying to induce the Co-operative Societies to take this up, and to facilitate the transport of fish to the different centres.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: Can the Government make arrnagments to purchase fish?

**Mr. M. M. Paul** *(Director of Food Supplies)*: No.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: In the interests of food supply, a ban has been introduced. What is the position of the supplier? He is not allowed to sell it to a purchaser outside the State, and it cannot also be preserved. Just as you purchase paddy, will you be pleased to purchase it and preserve it for the use of the consumer. Otherwise, where is the fisher. You don't allow him to sell, you are not prepared to purchase it from him. What is he to do with the stock he has collected and kept and is he to simply go on collecting and keeping them without any drainage for the stock? Or is he to remain without doing any work? Now that is a serious question. In view of the spirit of the ban which has been introduced, will the Government be prepared to purchase the stock?

**Mr. M. M. Paul** *(Director of Food Supplies)*: There are offers from several merchants to transport fish to different parts of the State. They may exhaust the stock. Only after seeing that they will not be able to exhaust, it does the question whether we should take it comes up.

**Mr. Joseph Pettha** *(Adur)*: Even this morning I was told by people from Narakkal that a lot of surplus fish they had to sell was sold in public auction; neither the Government will buy it nor will they allow it to be exported.

**Mr. A. B. Salem** *(Mattanchari)*: That is a big lie.

**Mr. Joseph Pettha** *(Adur)*: Food production in these days should go on unrestricted. The Government pleads that the amount of this tax is after all very small. So much the more reason then that Government should give up this small income that stands as an impediment in the matter of food production, in these days when all possible steps for increasing the food supply of the State have to be encouraged.

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*: On this account there has been no obstacle in the production.

**Mr. A. B. Salem** *(Mattancheri)*: Let the people of Narakkal bring any quantity of fish to Mattancheri. I assure them a market there. I am prepared to buy fish for even Rs. 500.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri)*: Your capacity ends there.

**Mr. K. S. Panicker** *(Mukundapuram)*: Is there any ban in British Malabar?

**Mr. M. M. Paul** *(Director of Food Supplies)*: There is ban in British Malabar and also in Travancore.

മിസ്റ്റർ വി. കെ. കുട്ടി: ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട റവന്യൂ മെമ്പർ പറഞ്ഞതുപോലെ ഇതിനൊരു ലൈസൻസു മാത്രമാണു ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു കൊടുത്തിരുന്നതു്. ആ ലൈസൻസിനു് മൂന്നുറുപ്പിക രണ്ടുറുപ്പിക, ഒന്നര ഉറുപ്പിക നിശ്ചയിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. സ്വന്തം കൃഷിസ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽനിന്നു് മത്സ്യം പിടിക്കുന്നവർക്കു് ഇതു വലിയ വിഷമമുള്ള സംഗതിയാണെന്നു് എനിക്കു വിശ്വാസമില്ല. വ്യവസായത്തിനുവേണ്ടി കൃഷിസ്ഥലങ്ങൾ കൂടുതൽ സംഖ്യ കൊടുത്തു പാട്ടത്തിനു വാങ്ങാറുണ്ടു്. ചെമ്മീൻ പിടിത്തത്തിനു മാത്രമായിട്ടാണു് അങ്ങിനെ വാങ്ങാറുള്ളതു്. ആ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ രണ്ടുതരത്തിലുള്ള വിഷമങ്ങളാണു് വ്യവസായികൾക്കു വന്നുകൂടുന്നതു്. ഒന്നാമതായിട്ടു് ഏക്കറേജു് ലൈസൻസു് ഫീസു് ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിലേക്കു കൊടുക്കുക, മറ്റൊന്നു് സ്ഥലത്തിന്റെ പാട്ടം. ഇങ്ങിനെ രണ്ടുതരത്തിൽ ആ വ്യവസായികൾ പണം കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്നു. ഞാൻ മുമ്പു പറഞ്ഞതുപോലെ സ്വന്തം സ്ഥലമുള്ളവർ അതു കെട്ടിയടച്ചു് ചെമ്മീൻ പിടിക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അവർ ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിലേക്കു് ഏക്കറേജു് കൊടുക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു് നഷ്ടം വരുവാനില്ല. നേരെമറിച്ചു പാട്ടത്തിനു് വാങ്ങിക്കുന്നവർക്കു നിശ്ചയമായും നഷ്ടം വരുമെ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ന്നള്ളത് തീർച്ചയാണ്. വർഷംതോറും ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള റമിഷൻ ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നതിനു് ശരിയായ ഒരു പോംവഴിയുണ്ടെന്നു് ഈ സഭയെ ധരിപ്പിക്കുവാനാണു് ഞാൻ ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നതു്. ചെമ്മീൻ ഇതിനു മുമ്പും കൊച്ചീരാജ്യത്തല്ല വിറ്റഴിച്ചിരുന്നതെന്നു് ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിന്റെ പല റിപ്പോർട്ടുകളിൽനിന്നും മനസ്സിലാക്കുവാൻ കഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ബമ്മ, സിങ്കപ്പൂർ മുതലായ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലാണു് ഇതിന്റെ മാർക്കറ്റുണ്ടായിരുന്നതു് എന്നു നമുക്കെല്ലാവർക്കും അറിയാം. ബമ്മ, സിങ്കപ്പൂർ എന്നീ സ്ഥലങ്ങൾ നഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടതോടുകൂടി ഈ രാജ്യത്തുനിന്നു ചെമ്മീൻ പുറംരാജ്യങ്ങളിലേക്കു കൊണ്ടുപോകുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലാതായിത്തീരുകയും മാർക്കറ്റു മന്ദീഭവിക്കയും, അതുമൂലം കച്ചവടം വളരെ നഷ്ടപ്പെടുകയും ചെയ്തു. ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള നഷ്ടം പരിഹരിക്കുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടിയാണു് ഈ റമിഷൻ ഇവിടെ കോട്ടത്തിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ചെമ്മീൻ വിറ്റഴിക്കുവാനുള്ള മാർക്കറ്റ് ഇവിടെ എങ്ങുമില്ലെന്നു് അറിയുവാൻ ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റി രൂപവൽക്കരിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യംപോലുമില്ല. ബമ്മാ രാജ്യത്തേക്കുള്ള കയറ്റുമതി നിന്നതോടുകൂടി ഇൻഡ്യയിലെ പല ഭാഗങ്ങളിലും ഇതിനുള്ള മാർക്കറ്റുകൾ ഇപ്പോൾ കണ്ടുപിടിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഇന്നത്തെ പരിതസ്ഥിതിവെച്ചു് പറയുന്നതായാൽ ഇതിന്റെ വിഷമങ്ങൾ പരിഹരിക്കുവാൻ ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് ഒരു മാർക്കറ്റ് കണ്ടുപിടിക്കേണ്ടതില്ലെന്നു് ഞാൻ ധൈര്യപൂർവ്വം പ്രസ്താവിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു. ഇതിൽ ഒരു സംഗതിമാത്രം ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു ചെയ്യേണ്ടതുണ്ടു്. അതായതു് ബമ്മ, സിങ്കപ്പൂർ മുതലായ രാജ്യങ്ങളിലേക്കു ചെമ്മീൻ കൊണ്ടുപോകുവാൻ അനുവദിച്ചിരുന്നതുപോലെ ഇൻഡ്യയുടെ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഭാഗത്തേക്കു കൊണ്ടുപോകുവാനും, വില്ക്കുവാനും ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു അനുവദിക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ഇതിനു് നല്ല വില കിട്ടുകയും ധാരാളം ചിലവുണ്ടാകുകയും ചെയ്യും. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട അവതാരകൻ പറഞ്ഞതുപോലെ ഇതിനു് ഒരു മാർക്കറ്റ് ആവശ്യമില്ല. പുറത്തേക്കു കൊണ്ടുപോകുവാനുള്ള അനുവാദം മാത്രം ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു കൊടുത്താൽ മതി. ഇതിനുള്ള റേറ്റു നോക്കുന്നപക്ഷം ഈ രാജ്യത്തു ജനിച്ചു വളർന്നവരാരുംതന്നെ ഇന്നത്തെ വിലക്കു വാങ്ങുകയില്ലെന്നുള്ളതു തീർച്ചയാണു്. ഇപ്പോൾ ഇതിനു ക്ഷാമം നിമിത്തം ഒരു ദൗർലഭ്യം ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഭക്ഷണത്തിനു അരിയില്ലാത്ത ഇക്കാലത്തു് ഒരു റാത്തൽ ചെമ്മീനു് എട്ടണയൊ പത്തണയൊ കൊടുത്തു് വാങ്ങാൻ സാധിക്കുമോ എന്നാണു് ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നതു്. ഈ രാജ്യത്തുണ്ടാകുന്ന മത്സ്യം ഒരു സ്ഥലത്തുനിന്നു മറ്റൊരു സ്ഥലത്തേക്കു കൊണ്ടുപോകുവാനുള്ള വിഷമം വളരെയുണ്ടു്. ഞാറക്കൽ നടക്കുന്ന സംഭവങ്ങൾ വളരെ ഭയങ്കരങ്ങളായിട്ടാണു് ഞാൻ കേൾക്കുന്നതു്. മത്സ്യചൂടുമേന്തി വില്പനക്കുവേണ്ടി ഉൾനാട്ടിലേക്കു പോകുന്നവരെക്കൂടി അധികൃതന്മാർ വിട്ടയക്കുന്നില്ല. അങ്ങിനെ കൊണ്ടുപോകുമ്പോൾ എക്സൈസ്കാരുടേയോ, പോലീസുകാരുടേയോ, സ്പെഷ്യൽഗാഡുമാരുടേയൊ കയ്യിൽ പെടാതെ അവക്കു രക്ഷപ്പെടാൻ തരമില്ല. ഈ സംഗതിയിൽ അന്യായവും അക്രമവും നടക്കുന്നതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു് ഞാൻ പഞ്ചായത്തിൽനിന്നും പോലീസ് കമ്മീഷണർ അവർകൾക്കും, എക്സൈസ് കമ്മീഷണർ അവർകൾക്കും എഴുതി അയച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. പോലീസ്കമ്മീഷണർ അവർകളുടെ മറുപടിയിൽ സൂപ്രണ്ട് ഡയറക്ടരെ സമീപിക്കുവാൻ പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നു. ബഃ സൂപ്രണ്ട് ഡയറക്ടരുടെതന്നെ മറുപടി, മത്സ്യം സ്റ്റോറിൽ എവിടെ കൊണ്ടുപോകുവാനും ആരുടേയും അനുവാദം ആവശ്യമില്ലെന്നാണു്. പച്ചമത്സ്യം തടയുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ മണിക്കൂർ കഴിയുമ്പോൾ എന്തായിരിക്കും അതിന്റെ സ്ഥിതിയെന്നു് നമുക്കറിയാം. ഒരണയോ രണ്ടണയോ നാലണയോ കിട്ടുമെന്നു വിചാരിച്ചാണു് അവർ പച്ചമത്സ്യക്കൊട്ടയുമായി പോകുന്നതു്. തടയുന്നതാരാണെന്നുവെച്ചാൽ അവരുടെ പേരും നമ്പറും കുറിച്ചയക്കാനാണു് കമ്മീഷണർ പറഞ്ഞതു്. ഞാൻ ആ നാടുകളിലേക്കു പോകാറില്ല. നാട്ടുഭാഷ എഴുതുവാനും വായിക്കുവാനുംകൂടി അറിയാത്തവരാണു് അവർ. അവർക്കു് ഇതു സാദ്ധ്യമാണോ? ബമ്മ നഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടതോടുകൂടി ആ നഷ്ടപരിഹാരത്തിനായി ഇപ്പോൾ യാതൊരു റമിഷനും അനുവദിക്കണമെന്നില്ല. അതു ധാരാളമായി കയറ്റി അയക്കുവാൻ അനുവദിച്ചാൽ മതിയെന്നാണു് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*: Before the motion is discussed further I wish to make one observation and that is this. Now this cut comes under the Revenue administration. For the administration of the Fishery Department and the preventing of the export of fish, no doubt, the government is responsible. But my department should not suffer. The discussion, therefore, should not be side-tracked in that way. I admit that the people are hard-hit on account of the loss of Burma market. I pray that I may not be found fault with for sticking to the very words of the cut motion. If the Burma market is lost what we have today is that we have to find out some other proper market. That we have done. If we have failed in

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

taking action certainly we should be found fault with. But some other agency comes and in spite of our best efforts it is not possible for us to send these things to the other market. It is not the fault of my department. The discussion upon this motion may kindly be limited to the scope of the motion. If you discuss the other matters I have no objection but it should not be made to influence the voting.

മിസ്റ്റർ ബി. എം. പീറർ: മിസ്റ്റർ പ്രസിഡെണ്ട്, സർ, ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. എനിക്കു് ഒരു പ്രത്യേക സംഗതി ഈ സഭയുടെ മുമ്പാകെ ധരിപ്പിക്കുവാനുണ്ടു്. പ്രോൺഫിഷു് വ്യവസായത്തെ കഴിയുന്നത്ര സഹായിക്കേണ്ടതാണു്. ബമ്മ നഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടതിലല്ല നമുക്കു പ്രധാനമായി ആലോചിക്കുവാനുള്ളതു്. ബമ്മയിലേക്കു് ഈ പോട്ടിൽനിന്നും ൫ ൦ ലക്ഷം ഉറുപ്പികയുടെ ചരക്കു് ഓരോ കൊല്ലത്തിലും അയക്കാറുണ്ടായിരുന്നു. ഇപ്പോൾ അതില്ലാത്തതു നിമിത്തം ഈ വ്യവസായം മന്ദീഭവിച്ചിരിക്കയാണു്. എന്തുകൊണ്ടെന്നാൽ ഒരു ഭാഗത്തു ഗവമ്മേണ്ടിലേക്കു് അവർ മുടുകൊടുത്തുവന്നിട്ടില്ലാത്ത വലുതായ ഒരു നികുതി ഇപ്പോൾ കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതായി വരുന്നു. അതേ സമയംതന്നെ ചരക്കു പുറത്തേക്കു വിടുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലാതെയും വരുന്നു. ക്രമത്തെ മത്സ്യം പിടിക്കുവാനാവശ്യമായ വലകളും ഉണ്ടാക്കുവാനും വലിയ ചിലവു ചെയ്യേണ്ടതായും വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഈ കാരണങ്ങൾകൊണ്ടാണു് ഈ വ്യവസായം മന്ദീഭവിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ഭക്ഷണസാധനങ്ങൾ അഭിവൃദ്ധിപ്പെടുത്തുവാനായി നാം പലദിക്കിലും പോയി പ്രസംഗിക്കുകയും, വേണ്ടത്ര പ്രോത്സാഹനം നൽകുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നുണ്ടു്. അങ്ങിനെയുള്ള പ്രസംഗവും പ്രോപ്പഗാൻറയും നന്നും ഇതിനാവശ്യമില്ല. കൃഷി ചെയ്യാനുള്ള മാഗ്ഗങ്ങൾ കൊച്ചിയിലെ കൃഷിക്കാർക്കറിയാം. അതിനു് ഒരു പ്രസംഗം ആവശ്യമില്ല. വളമാണു് കൃഷിക്കു വേണ്ടതു്. ചെമ്മീൻപൊടി കൃഷിക്കു പറ്റിയ വളമാണെന്നും ഏവർക്കുമറിയാം. വളമാണു് കിട്ടാൻ പ്രയാസമായിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ചെമ്മീൻപൊടിയാണു് നമുക്കു് ആവശ്യമായിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ഒരു കണ്ടി ചെമ്മീൻപൊടിക്കു് യുദ്ധത്തിനുമുമ്പു് ൫ ഉറുപ്പികയേ വിലയുണ്ടായിരുന്നുള്ളു. ഇപ്പോൾ ൫൦ ഉറുപ്പിക കൊടുത്താലും കിട്ടാൻ വിഷമമാണു്. ഒരു കണ്ടി പരിപ്പിനു് ൨൫൦, ൩൦൦ ഉറുപ്പിക വിലയുണ്ടായിരുന്നു. അതും ഇപ്പോൾ ആ വിലക്കു കിട്ടാൻ സാദ്ധ്യമല്ല. കൃഷിയെ പോഷിപ്പിക്കണമെന്നു ഗവമ്മേണ്ടുദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതിനു സൈഡു് ലയിനായി ഗവമ്മേണ്ടു് മത്സ്യ വ്യവസായത്തെ പോഷിപ്പിക്കണമെന്നാണു് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നതു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായർ: അതിലേക്കു് എന്തൊക്കെയാണു് ചെയ്യേണ്ടതെന്നുള്ളതിനു ശരിയായ ഒരു സജഷൻ തന്നാൽകൊള്ളാം.

മിസ്റ്റർ ബി. എം. പീറർ: അതുപൊടുന്നനവെ പറയുവാൻ പ്രയാസമാണു്. കുറെ കൂടി ആലോചിച്ചു പറഞ്ഞുകൊള്ളാം.

***Mr. A. V. Moothedan** *(Chalakkudi)*:* Sir, I have to say only two sentences. The Hon'ble Mover wants relief by two methods. First of all, he wants a wholesale remission of tax. Then the ban on the export of fish should be lifted. Regarding the remission of tax it ought to be allowed as the Government have been pleased to allow in the case of agricultural lands, as was pointed out by the Hon'ble Member for Adoor, as a stimulus for cultivation for raising food crop. This also is a food. Therefore, to encourage people to fish this tax should be remitted. Not a big amount. Half has lready been remitted.

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar)*:* It is only occasional second crops charges that have been remitted. Not the other thing. Second crops are more or less liable to failure. Here the matter is different. So that they may not take the risk "If you sow you have to pay whether you reap or not" we said where you do not get anything you shall not pay. This case is entirely different.

***Mr. A. V. Moothedan** *(Chalakkudi)*:* You must induce them to fish. The phrase "occasional crop" is misleading. Every year in our villages they raise the second crop. Even then it is called occasional crop. The word is very misleading. Every year they raise second crop in our fields and the Government continue to collect tax. Likewise the landholders catch prawns every year and the Government collect tax although it is called a license fee.

The amount involved is not very large. The Government may consider that very sympathetically.

Now regarding the lifting of the ban on export of fish I have to say something. The object of the ban is to make more fish available in Cochin. As a consequence of that ban on fish export for the last two or three months our experience is that we get less fish. There is

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

no fish available in Ernakulam as before. We eat fish. The price is very high. Two or three days back one കൊഞ്ച് was sold for one rupee. Formerly it was sold at one anna. The Revenue member does not know about this because he is a vegetarian. We people in Ernakulam who are fish-eaters find it very difficult to get fish. We send our servants to the market. They say no fish. We have to depend upon vegetables. If we consume vegetables that will affect you. Therefore, don't compel us to eat more vegetables.

Then there is another complaint. The Valas and Arayas are the fishermen in the State. They are unanimous in their opinion that this ban has hit them adversely and the industry is ruined. Many of the people have sold their nets and gone to Assam or Ceylon because it is not worthwhile to fish and as pointed out by the Hon'ble Member for Labour it is very difficult to transport fish to these places. They have to pass through so many peons and Excise Officers. This fish ought to be brought to the market quickly. Half an hour's delay will make them useless. Therefore it should be brought to the market expeditiously. It is like rice and paddy. Therefore, the position of the fisherman is very much affected. The Director of Food Supplies is a fish-eater. But he does not sufficiently realise these difficulties. Therefore, what I submit is if you want to develop this fishing industry please lift the ban on the export of fish. Before, the practice was there were some merchants here in Ernakulam who were exporting iced fish to British India. That industry for the past 30 years, they were developing and many fishermen were depending upon it. They used to advance money freely to these Valas and Arayans and they catch fish from Narakkal and other places and bring the fishes here. All these fish would not be purchased by these merchants. Whatever fish is not purchased by them they bring to the market and we used to get plenty of fish from the market. Now that the export of fish is not allowed no fisherman will bring fish here. There are no people to advance money to them. That is why there is so much scarcity for fish here. I think if it is the object of the Government to have more food then it is better to have free trade in fish.

**Mr. A. B. Salem** *(Mattancheri):* Sir, on this matter I wish to draw the attention of the House that the income under Fisheries is Rs. 19,782. The expenditure on fisheries is Rs. 16,603. The net income of Government is Rs. 3,179 from the fishing stakes, inland fisheries, minor fisheries, fines and forfeitures. This revenue, the Government gets from very poor people. As a matter of fact the Government has nothing to spend to make a fish. They do absolutely no work of any kind in breeding fish or in giving any facilities for increasing the number of fishes in the waters. Doing absolutely nothing (and these are Nature's free gift unto to man) these should not have been taxed at all. Government mistook a report that I submitted to the Government some years ago and levied taxes upon fishermen. It was never my idea to tax them. It was only to give them more facilities to make more fish in the land so that people may eat this nitrogenous food and become much better in health. Why the ban is asked to be removed? There is an excellent reason. The Hon'ble Member for Adur, Mr. Petta, said that the Narakkal people have been complaining that on account of this ban they get no money. That is not correct. It is not worthwhile for them to catch fiah and bring them all the way to Ernakulam. They are to be used as quickly as possible or they will have to be thrown away. But if fish can be transported quickly and easily to places where they are eaten there will be something. Has the Government provided a refregerator boat? Has the Governmet provided quick transport from the field to the place where they are marketed? You do absolutely no constructive work of any productive kind and yet you take tax from them. My humble submission is that you need not infer that the prawns that were going from Cochin were caught in Cochin alone. Certainly 70 per cent of the fish that was passing from Cochin to Burma and other parts was from Travancore and other parts. The actual prawns that have been caught here and prepared for export is a very small proportion of it. I do not think that it would be even 25 per cent of the export. Mattancheri is a great distributing centre. For all the prawns that used to come from Travancore and other neighbouring parts the market had been Mattancheri. So you cauld not from that deduce that the prawns that were going from Cochin to Burma are all prawns that were bred and caught from Cochin soil. That is a misunderstanding. It is an ordinary article of food. Have you got such a large quantity of fish caught in Cochin that should be stopped from exporting. The fact remains that this ban is not working any good and is only working some hardship.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan** *(Vadakkancheri):* Great hardship.

**Mr. A. B. Salem** *(Mattancheri):* It was intended to give benefit but the benefit is not there and therefore there is no use of our sticking to our mistakes and our muddles. It is a fact that Travancore has imposed a ban and it has become a fashion to copy everything that Travancore does. The reason is different. The reason is the Travancore Government was burning under

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

a sensation that they were not being adequately supplied with rice and promises made to them were broken. With this kind of feelings in them the Government thought that they would also take some kind of retaliatory measures and said "We will ban everything that is going from Travancore to British India". I would respectfully ask the Government and the Food Director to consider and remove the ban upon fish. I will also ask the Government to do away with this revenue from fishes and this little department.

Apart from that I have got another suggestion to the Hon'ble Minister. This is decidedly a shell fish. The kernal is called *parippu* and the shell, *i.e.*, the outer covering is called *podi*. I have not tasted that fish at all. My religion forbids me from eating it. Therefore, I cannot eat it. I am not in the least affected by it. You can eat the entire lot. This is an excellent manure if mixed with other substances in a certain proportion. After all the quantity that may be produced in Cochin, although my friend Mr. Peter has said that 50 lakhs worth of manure is to come, you will not get 5 lakhs worth of manure. If you can collect this podi and ask one of your agricultural experts to find out how it shoul be mixed with ashes, leaves or some other manure you will get excellent manure to manure our lands which then would give us not eightfold increase but may give us 16 fold increase. It will increase the produce of the land and enrich the soil, make it rich and yield much more than what you will spend. Some depots may be opened by the Government. Let us see how they will work. These prawns may be bought by the Government. As Mr. Kutty said there is no use of government finding out any market. The merchants will find it out. This valuable manure if lost from the soil, will not come back to us. When it is taken out of the country the agriculturists become poorer. If it is possible for the Government to make an experiment in that way to see whether government cannot buy some of these prawns it will be good. But if you actually go to buy you will not get it.

**Mr. T. K. Nayar** *(Minister for Rural Development):* The expert opinion is that the kernel is not good for manure.

**Mr. A. B. Salem** *(Mattancheri):* This kernal will last for three or four months. In Burma they used to make what they call *nappi*. It is an excellent pickle. They mix it with some condiments and tamarind and eat it. ചൊമ്മീനും ചോറും കിട്ടിയാൽ മതി; തൃപ്തിയാകും. That is a very good combination. The kernal after three or four months putrifies and then it will become very good manure.

**Deputy President :** Mr. Salem, it is 5 o'clock. I must put the demand to vote.

*Demand put and carried*

## 1. Land Revenue (Cranganur)—Rs. 29,550

**Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu** *(Diwan Peishkar):* Sir, I move for a grant of Rs. 29,550 for Land Revenue—Cranganur.

*Demand put and carried*

*The House rose for the day at 5-5 p.m.*

N. S. RADHAKRISHNA SARMA

*Secretary to the Council*

———

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly